



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/041,633

01/10/2002

Akio Kobayashi

111632

6574

25944

7590

02/26/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

SHAY, DAVID M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3735

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Applicant has submitted new drawings. These drawings are accepted.

With regard to the art rejection, applicant argues that Kubota does not disclosed the claimed energy densities, because Kubota discusses the use of 2.54 j/cm^2 , referring to the examiner's attribution thereto of the teaching of 50 to 250 mJ/cm^2 as a "misinterpretation". The examiner must, respectfully disagree. The Kubota reference uses 213 nm radiation, and gives the 2.54 j/cm^2 in the context of using that radiation, Kubota goes on to note that this energy density-wavelength combination provides the same speed of tissue removal as the energy density-wavelength combination of 50 to 250 mJ/cm^2 at 193 nm. Thus it is clear that these two sets of parameters are equivalent for the purposes of operating on cell walls.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abela et al ('982) in combination with Matsuura et al (1998), Kubota et al, and Lewis et al. Abela et al ('982) teach the method as claimed except for the specific recitation of the use of a hollow fiber, the specific laser energies, or the quartz chip (please note that the absence of the quartz chip implies the absence of other structures predicated thereon, such as the hydroxide groups). Matsuura et al (1998) teaches forming hollow waveguides for the delivery of excimer laser light from hollow fibers that are coated with aluminum and are filled with an inert gas. Lewis et al teaches the desirability of using a wave guiding device with a tapered tip in a medical system and method for applying high energy radiation. Kubota et al teach that producing holes in cell walls can be done using energy densities between 50 and 250 mJ/cm^2 with 193 nm light (see column 5, line 17-23). Lewis et al teach the desirability of providing a tapered structure on

Art Unit: 3735

the distal end of a hollow optical fiber delivering 193 nm radiation. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ a device and method as taught by Abela et al ('982) in the device and method of Matsuura et al (1998) since Matsuura et al (1998) specifically discloses the desirability of using hollow waveguides in medical applications; or to use the device and method of Matsuura et al (1998) in the device and method of Abela et al ('982), since Abela et al ('982) disclose no particular fibers and since these fibers efficiently transmit high energy radiation while exhibiting favorable bending radii; and in either case to employ the tapered tip of Lewis et al, since this provides beam sizes in the range required by Abela et al ('982); or to employ the tapered tip of Lewis et al on the waveguide of Abela et al ('982), since this provides beam sizes in the range required by Abela et al ('982), or to employ the device and method of Abela et al ('982) in the device and method of Lewis et al, since Lewis et al disclose drilling through cell walls as a preferred use of the device, and in either case to employ the hollow waveguide of Matsuura et al (1998), since this allows for the transmission of greater energies and avoids the formation of color centers, which is a problem, as taught by Lewis et al; or to provide the method and device of Lewis et al in the method and device of Matsuura et al (1998), since the tapered tip of Lewis et al provides greater energies and or to provide the method and hollow waveguide device of Matsuura et al (1998) in the device and method of Lewis et al, since this would avoid the production of color centers and enable larger energies to be delivered, and in either case to employ the method and device of Abela et al since this is a medical method as suggested by Matsuura et al (1998), which would benefit from the delivery of high energy radiation and since this device and method is useful for drilling into cell walls, as taught by Lewis et al; and in any case, to apply laser energy density in the range claimed, since can be used

Art Unit: 3735

to produce holes in cell walls, as taught by Kubota et al; to employ a chip as claimed, since this condenses the light and is commercially available, as taught at paragraph [0051] of the instant disclosure; to use any of the claimed inert gasses, since these are all well known inert gasses in the art, are not critical and provide no unexpected result, thus producing a method such as claimed.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,132,289. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the patent anticipate the claims of the application. Accordingly, instant application claims are not patentably distinct from the patent claims. Here, the patent claims require elements A, B, C, and D while instant application claim 1 only requires elements A, B, and C. Thus it is apparent that the more specific patent claims encompass the instant application claims. Following the rationale in *In re Goodman* cited in the preceding paragraph, where applicant has once been granted a patent containing a claim for the specific or

narrower invention, applicant may not then obtain a second patent with a claim for the generic or broader invention without first submitting an appropriate terminal disclaimer.

Applicant's arguments filed November 26, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments are not persuasive for the reasons set forth above.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to david shay whose telephone number is (571) 272-4773. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor, II, can be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/david shay/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3735